Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for the Strong Law of Large Numbers for U-statistics *†

Rafał Latała and Joel Zinn

Warsaw University and Texas A&M University

Abstract

Under some mild regularity on the normalizing sequence, we obtain necessary and sufficient conditions for the Strong Law of Large Numbers for (symmetrized) U-statistics. We also obtain nasc's for the a.s. convergence of series of an analogous form.

1 Introduction.

The general question addressed in this paper is that of necessary and sufficient conditions for

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_n}\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_n}\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}}h(X_{\mathbf{i}})\to 0,\ \text{a.s.}\ ,$$

where $I_n=\{\mathbf{i}=(i_i,i_2,\ldots,i_d):1\le i_1<i_2<\ldots<i_d\le n\}$, $\{X_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of iid r.v.'s, $X_{\mathbf{i}}=(X_{i_1},\cdots,X_{i_d})$. With no loss of generality we may assume that h is symmetric in its arguments.

Further, as in [CGZ] and in [Zh1], it is also important to consider the question of the almost sure convergence to zero of

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_n}\max_{\mathbf{i}\in I_n}|h(X_{\mathbf{i}})|.$$

* *AMS 1991 Subject Classification*: Primary 60F15, Secondary 60E15

† *Key words and phrases*: U-statistics, Strong Law of Large Numbers, random series

In fact, it is through the study of this problem that one is able to complete the characterization for the original question.

Without the symmetrization by Rademachers, Hoeffding ([H]) in 1961 proved that for general d and $\gamma_n = \binom{n}{d}$, mean zero is sufficient for the normalized sum above to go to zero almost surely. And, under a p^{th} moment one has the a.s. convergence to zero with $\gamma_n = n^{\frac{d}{p}}$ ([S] when $0 < p < 1$, in the product case with mean zero [T] for $1 \leq p < 2$ and in the case of general degenerate h [GZ] for $1 < p < 2$).

It is somewhat surprising that it took until the 90's to see that Hoeffding's sufficient condition was not necessary ([GZ]). In the particular case in which $d = 2$, $h(x, y) = xy$ and the variables are symmetric, necessary and sufficient conditons were given in ([CGZ]) in 1995. This was later extended to $d \geq 3$ by Zhang ([Zh1]). Very recently Zhang [Zh2] obtained "computable" necessary and sufficient conditions in the case $d = 2$ and, in general, found equivalent conditions in terms of a law of large numbers for modified maxima. Other related work is that of [M] in which the different indices go to infinity at their own pace and [G] in which the variables in different coordinates can be based on different distributions.

In this paper we obtain nasc's for strong laws for 'maxima' for general d. This likely would have enabled one to complete Zhang's program. However, we also found a more classical way of handling the reduction of the case of sums to the case of max's.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the necessary notation and give the basic Lemmas. Now the form of our main Theorem is inductive. The reason we present the result in this form is that the conditions in the case $d > 2$ are quite involved. Because of the format of our Theorem we first present in Section 3, the case that the function, h, is the product of the coordinates. As mentioned earlier, this case received quite a bit attention, culminating in Zhang's paper ([Zh1]). In the first part of Section 3 we show how the methods developed in this paper allow one to give a relatively simple, and perhaps transparent, proof of Zhang's result. We, then, prove the main result, namely, the nasc's for the Strong Law for symmetric U-statistics. Again, because of our inductive format, in order to clearly bring out the main idea's of our proof, we also give a simple proof of Zhang's result for the case $d = 2$.

Finally in Section 4 we consider the question of convergence of multidimensional random series $\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in Z_+^d} h_{\mathbf{i}}(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}})$. We obtain necessary and suf-

ficient conditions for a.s. convergence in the case of nonnegative or symmetrized kernels. This generalizes the results of [KW1] (case $d = 2$ and $h_{i,j}(x, y) = a_{i,j}xy$).

2 Preliminaries and Basic Lemmas.

Let us first introduce multiindex notation we will use in the paper:

- $\mathbf{i} = (i_i, i_2, \ldots, i_d)$-multiindex of size d
- $X_{\mathbf{i}} = (X_{i_i}, X_{i_2}, \ldots, X_{i_d})$, where X_j is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with values in some space E and the common law μ
- $\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}} = (X^{(1)}_{i_i}, X^{(2)}_{i_2}, \ldots, X^{(d)}_{i_d})$, where $(X^{(k)}_j)$, $k = 1, \ldots, d$ are independent copies of (X_j),
- $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}} = \varepsilon_{i_1}\varepsilon_{i_2}\cdots\varepsilon_{i_d}$, where (ε_i) is a Rademacher sequence (i.e. a sequence of i.i.d. symmetric random variables taking on values ± 1) independent of other random variables
- $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mathbf{i}} = \varepsilon^{(1)}_{i_1}\varepsilon^{(2)}_{i_2}\cdots\varepsilon^{(d)}_{i_d}$, where $(\varepsilon^{(j)}_i)$ is a doubly indexed Rademacher sequence independent of other random variables
- $\mu_k = \otimes_{i=1}^k \mu$ - product measure on E^k
- for $I \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$, by E_I and $E^{'}_I$ we will denote expectation with respect to $(X^k_i)_{k\in I}$ and $(X^k_i)_{k\notin I}$ respectively
- $\mathbf{i}_I = (i_k)_{k\in I}$ and $I^{'} = \{1, 2, \ldots, d\} \setminus I$ for $I \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$
- $I_n = \{\mathbf{i} = (i_i, i_2, \ldots, i_d) : 1 \le i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_d \le n\}$,
- $C_n = \{\mathbf{i} = (i_i, i_2, \ldots, i_d) : 1 \le i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_d \le n\}$
- $A^{I,x} = A^{x_I} = \{z \in E^I : \exists a \in A, a_I = x_I, a_{I'} = z\}$ for $A \subset E^d, I \subset \{1, \ldots, d\}$.

The results in this section were motivated by the difficulty in computing quantities such as:

$$P(\max_{i,j\le n} h(X_i, Y_j) > t),$$

where $\{X_i\}$ are independent random variables and $\{Y_i\}$ is an independent copy, and h is, say, symmetric in its arguments.

In the one-dimensional case, namely, $P(\max_{i\leq n}\xi_i > t)$, where $\{\xi_i\}$ are independent r.v.'s, we have the simple inequality

$$\frac{1}{2}\min(\sum_i P(|\xi_i| > t), 1) \leq P(\max_i |\xi_i| > t) \leq \min(\sum_i P(|\xi_i| > t), 1). \quad (1)$$

If this type of inequality held for any dimension, the proofs and results would look much the same as in dimension 1. Here we give an example to see the difference between the cases $d = 1$ and $d > 1$.

Consider the set in the unit square given by:

$$A = \{(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 : x < a, y < b \text{ or } x < b, y < a\}$$

and assume that the X_i, Y_j are iid uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$. By (1) it easily follows that

$$P(\max_{1\leq i,j\leq n} I_A(X_i, Y_j) > 0) \sim \min(na, 1)\min(nb, 1),$$

which is equivalent to $\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} P(I_A(X_i, Y_j) > 0) \sim n^2 ab$ if and only if both a and b are of order $O(\frac{1}{n})$.$\square$

Lemma 1 *Suppose that the nonnegative functions $f_{\mathbf{i}}(x_{\mathbf{i}})$ satisfy the following conditions*

$$f_{\mathbf{i}}(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) \leq 1 \;\; a.s. \;\; for\ all\ \mathbf{i} \quad (2)$$

$$E_I \sum_{\mathbf{i}_I} f_{\mathbf{i}}(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) \leq 1 \;\; a.s. \;\; for\ any\ I \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, d\},\ 0 < \mathrm{Card}(I) < d \quad (3)$$

Let $\tilde{m}_1 = E\sum_{\mathbf{i}} f_{\mathbf{i}}(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}})$, then

$$E(\sum_{\mathbf{i}} f_{\mathbf{i}}(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}))^2 \leq \tilde{m}_1^2 + (2^d - 1)\tilde{m}_1 \quad (4)$$

and

$$P(\sum_{\mathbf{i}} f_{\mathbf{i}}(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\tilde{m}_1) \geq 2^{-d-2}\min(\tilde{m}_1, 1). \quad (5)$$

Proof. Let $S(d)$ denote the family of nonempty subsets of $\{1,\ldots,d\}$ and for a fixed $I \in S(d)$ and $\mathbf{i}$ let

$$\tilde{J}(\mathbf{i}, I) = \{\mathbf{j} : \mathbf{j}_I = \mathbf{i}_I \text{ and } j_k \neq i_k \text{ for all } k \notin I\}.$$

Then we have by (2) and (3)

$$E(\sum_{\mathbf{i}} f_{\mathbf{i}}(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}))^2 \leq (E\sum_{\mathbf{i}} f_{\mathbf{i}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}))^2 + \sum_{I\in S(d)} \sum_{\mathbf{i}} E_I E_I^{'} f_{\mathbf{i}}(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) E_I^{'} \sum_{j\in \tilde{J}(\mathbf{i},I)} f_{\mathbf{j}}(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{j}})$$

$$\leq m_1^2 + \sum_{I\in S(d)} \sum_{\mathbf{i}} E_I E_I^{'} f_{\mathbf{i}}(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) = m_1^2 + (2^d - 1)m_1.$$

The inequality (5) follows by (4) and the Paley-Zygmund inequality. $\square$

The next Lemma is an undecoupled version of Lemma 1, the proof of it is similar as of Lemma 1 and is omitted.

Lemma 2 *Suppose that the nonnegative functions $f_{\mathbf{i}}(x_{\mathbf{i}})$ satisfy the following conditions*

$$f_{\mathbf{i}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \leq 1 \text{ a.s. for all } \mathbf{i}$$

and

$$E_I^{'} \sum_{j\in J(\mathbf{i},I)} f_{\mathbf{j}}(X_{\mathbf{j}}) \leq 1 \text{ a.s. for all } \mathbf{i} \text{ and } I \subset \{1,2,\ldots,d\},\ 0 < \mathrm{Card}(I) < d\ ,$$

where

$$J(\mathbf{i}, I) = \{\mathbf{j} : \{k : \exists_l\ i_k = j_l\} = I\}.$$

Let $m_1 = E\sum_{\mathbf{i}} f_{\mathbf{i}}(X_{\mathbf{i}})$, then

$$E(\sum_{\mathbf{i}} f_{\mathbf{i}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}))^2 \leq m_1^2 + (2^d - 1)m_1 \tag{6}$$

and

$$P(\sum_{\mathbf{i}} f_{\mathbf{i}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}m_1) \geq 2^{-d-2}\min(m_1, 1). \tag{7}$$

In the rest of this paper we will refer to the next Corollary as the "Section Lemma".

Corollary 1 *If the set $A \subset E^d$ satisfies the condition*

$$n^{d-l}\mu_{d-l}(A^{I,X_I}) \leq 1 \text{ a.s. for all } I \subset \{1,\dots,d\} \text{ with } 0 < \mathrm{Card}(I) = l < d$$

then

$$P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in C_n} \tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}} \in A) \geq 2^{-d-2}\min(n^d\mu_d(A), 1)$$

and for $n \geq d$

$$P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in I_n} X_{\mathbf{i}} \in A) \geq 2^{-d-2}d^{-d}\min(n^d\mu_d(A), 1).$$

Proof. The first inequality follows immediately by Lemma 1 applied to $f_{\mathbf{i}} = I_A$. To prove the second inequality we use Lemma 2 and notice that

$$\min(\binom{n}{d}\mu_d(A), 1) \geq d^{-d}\min(n^d\mu_d(A), 1). \square$$

3 Strong Laws of Large Numbers

We will assume in this section that the sequence γ_n satisfy the following regularity conditions

$$\gamma_n \text{ is nondecreasing} \tag{8}$$

$$\gamma_{2n} \leq C\gamma_n \text{ for any } n \tag{9}$$

$$\sum_{k\geq l}\frac{2^{dk}}{\gamma_{2^k}^2} \leq C\frac{2^{dl}}{\gamma_{2^l}^2} \text{ for any } l = 1, 2, \dots \tag{10}$$

As mentioned in the Introduction we first give a proof of Zhang's result [Zh1] for the product case i.e. $h(x) = \prod_{i=1}^d x_i$ for $x \in R^d$. To state the SLLN in this case we need to define numbers c_n by the formula

$$c_n = \min\{c > 0 : nE(\frac{X^2}{c^2} \wedge 1) \leq 1\}.$$

Theorem 1 *Assume that $h(x) = \prod_{i=1}^d x_i$, and that the r.v.'s X_i are symmetric. Then, under the regularity assumptions (8)-(10), the following are equivalent:*

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_n} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_n} h(X_{\mathbf{i}}) = \frac{1}{\gamma_n} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_n} \prod_{r=1}^d X_{i_r} \to 0 \ a.s. \tag{11}$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{kl} P\Big(\prod_{r=1}^{l} X_r^2 > \frac{\gamma_{2^k}^2}{c_{2^k}^{2(d-l)}}, \min_{r \le l} X_r^2 > c_{2^k}^2\Big) < \infty \ \textit{for all } 1 \le l \le d. \tag{12}$$

Proof. We give only the proof of the necessity of the conditions (12). The sufficiency can be proved as in the Theorem 2. Let

$$T_n^{(r)} = \sum_{i_r=1}^{n} {X_{i_r}^{(r)}}^2$$

and

$$T_n^{(r)}(c) = \sum_{i_r=1}^{n} {X_{i_r}^{(r)}}^2 \wedge c^2.$$

Step 1. We first reduce to the sum of squares, i.e. we will show that condition (11) implies

$$\gamma_n^{-2} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_n} \prod_{r=1}^d X_{i_r}^2 \to 0 \text{ a.s.} \tag{13}$$

By the symmetry of X we have that $\gamma_n^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_n} \prod_{r=1}^d \varepsilon_{i_r} X_{i_r} \to 0$ a.s. Thus for a.a. sequences (X_i), the Walsh sums (i.e. the linear combinations of products of d Rademachers) converge to 0 a.s. Hence, they converge in probability. This implies (by a result of Bonami about hypercontractivity of Walshes [B]) that for a.a. sequences (X_i), $\gamma_n^{-2} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_n} \prod_{r=1}^d X_{i_r}^2 \to 0$ and (13) is proved.

Step 2. We now go to a diadic subsequence and then decouple. By the Borel-Cantelli Lemma, the condition (13) implies that

$$\forall_{\varepsilon > 0} \ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P\Big(\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_{2^{k-1}}} \prod_{r=1}^d X_{i_r}^2 \ge \varepsilon \gamma_{2^k}^2\Big) < \infty.$$

Now let us notice that $I_{2^k} \supseteq \{\mathbf{i} \in I_{2^k} : (r-1)2^{k-l} < i_r \leq r2^{k-l}\}$ if l is such that $2^l \geq d$. Moreover the random variables in these blocks are independent of the other blocks, thus we obtain

$$\forall_{\varepsilon>0} \sum_{k=l+1}^{\infty} P\Big(\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in C_{2^{k-l-1}}} \prod_{r=1}^{d} (X_{i_r}^{(r)})^2 \geq \varepsilon \gamma_{2^k}^2\Big) < \infty.$$

Hence, using the regularity assumption (9)

$$\forall_{\varepsilon>0} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P\Big(\prod_{r=1}^{d} T_{2^k}^{(r)} \geq \varepsilon \gamma_{2^k}^2\Big) < \infty. \tag{14}$$

Step 3. At this point we use 1-dimensional case of Lemma 1. We apply it to

$$c_n^{-2} T_n^{(r)}(c_n) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(X_j^{(r)})^2}{c_n^2} \wedge 1$$

and notice that $E c_n^{-2} T_n^{(r)}(c_n) = 1$ by the definition of c_n. We get that

$$P(T_n^{(r)}(c_n) \geq \frac{1}{2} c_n^2) = P(c_n^{-2} T_n^{(r)}(c_n) \geq \frac{1}{2} E c_n^{-2} T_n^{(r)}(c_n)) \geq \frac{1}{8}.$$

Hence

$$P\Big(\prod_{r=l+1}^{d} T_n^{(r)} \geq \frac{c_n^{2(d-l)}}{2^{d-l}}\Big) \geq P\Big(\prod_{r=l+1}^{d} T_n^{(r)}(c_n) \geq \frac{c_n^{2(d-l)}}{2^{d-l}}\Big) \geq \Big(\frac{1}{8}\Big)^{d-l}$$

and

$$P\Big(\prod_{r=1}^{d} T_n^{(r)} \geq 2^{l-d} \gamma_{2^k}^2\Big) \geq \Big(\frac{1}{8}\Big)^{d-l} P\Big(\prod_{r=1}^{l} T_n^{(r)} \geq \frac{\gamma_{2^k}^2}{c_{2^k}^{2(d-l)}}\Big).$$

Thus condition (14) yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P\Big(\max_{i_1,\dots,i_l \leq 2^k} \prod_{r=1}^{l} (X_{i_r}^{(r)})^2 > \frac{\gamma_{2_k}^2}{c_{2^k}^{2(d-l)}}\Big) < \infty \tag{15}$$

Now, here is the **main point**.

Step 4. At this point we need to replace the max inside the probability with 2^{kl} outside the probability. To do this we use the Section Lemma (Corollary 1).

To get small sections there are a variety of choices. To obtain Zhang's result, we reduce the probabilities even further by intersecting the sets in the following manner.

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\max_{i_1,\dots,i_l \le 2^k} \prod_{r=1}^{l} (X_{i_r}^{(r)})^2 I_{\{(X_{i_r}^{(r)})^2 > c_{2^k}^2\}} > \frac{\gamma_{2_k}^2}{c_{2^k}^{2(d-l)}}) < \infty$$

To see why we have small sections, just note that

$$P(X^2 > c_{2^k}^2) \le \frac{E(X^2 \wedge c_{2^k}^2)}{c_{2^k}^2} = \frac{1}{2^k}.$$

Now we just use the Section lemma to get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{kl} P(\prod_{r=1}^{l} X_r^2 I_{\{X_r^2 > c_{2^k}^2\}} > \frac{\gamma_{2_k}^2}{c_{2^k}^{2(d-l)}}) < \infty$$

Or, equivalently,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{kl} P(\prod_{r=1}^{l} X_r^2 > \frac{\gamma_{2_k}^2}{c_{2^k}^{2(d-l)}}, \min_{1\le r\le l} X_r^2 > c_{2^k}^2) < \infty,$$

which yields (12). □

In Theorem 2 we reduce the SLLN for symmetric or nonnegative kernels to a SLLN for "modified maxima". To see what this means consider the case $d = 2$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k,2} = \{(x,y) \in E^2 : \quad & h^2(x,y) \le \gamma_{2^k}^2, 2^k E_Y h^2 I_{h^2 \le \gamma_{2^k}}(x,Y) \le \gamma_{2^k}^2, \\ & 2^k E_X h^2 I_{h^2 \le \gamma_{2^k}}(X,y) \le \gamma_{2^k}^2\}. \end{aligned}$$

So that

$$\{\exists \mathbf{i} \in C_{2^k}, \tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}} \notin A_{k,2}\} = \{\max_{\mathbf{i} \in C_{2^k}} \varphi(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) > \gamma_{2^k}^2\},$$

where

$$\varphi(x,y) = h^2(x,y) \vee 2^k E_Y h^2 I_{h^2 \le \gamma_{2^k}}(x,Y) \vee 2^k E_X h^2 I_{h^2 \le \gamma_{2^k}}(X,y).$$

In [Zh2] Zhang, using different methods, also reduced the probem to "modified maxima". We continue in Theorem 3 to find nasc's for the SLLN for the maximum, which, hence, could also be used to complete Zhang's program.

For a measurable function h on E^d which is symmetric with respect to permutations of the variables, we define for $k = 1, 2, \dots$

$$A_{k,1} = \{x \in E^d : h^2(x) \leq \gamma_{2^k}^2\}$$

and for $l = 1, \dots, d-1$

$$A_{k,l+1} = \{x \in A_{k,l} : 2^{kl} E_I h^2 I_{A_{k,l}}(x) \leq \gamma_{2^k}^2 \text{ for all } I \subset \{1, 2, \dots d\}, \ \mathrm{Card}(I) = l\}.$$

Theorem 2 *Suppose that assumptions (8)-(10) are satisfied and the sets $A_{k,l}$ are defined as above. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_n} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_n} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}} h(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \to 0 \ \ a.s. \tag{16}$$

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_n} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in C_n} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\mathbf{i}} h(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) \to 0 \ \ a.s. \tag{17}$$

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_n^2} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_n} h^2(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \to 0 \ \ a.s. \tag{18}$$

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_n^2} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in C_n} h^2(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) \to 0 \ \ a.s. \tag{19}$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\exists_{\mathbf{i} \in I_{2^k}} \ X_{\mathbf{i}} \notin A_{k,d}) < \infty \tag{20}$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\exists_{\mathbf{i} \in C_{2^k}} \ \tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}} \notin A_{k,d}) < \infty \tag{21}$$

Proof. (16)⇒(18) and (17)⇒(19) - proofs of these implications are the same as in Proposition 4.7 in [CGZ] (see also Step 1 in the proof of Theorem 1)

(18)⇒(19) Let l be such that $2^l \geq d$. By the regularity of γ_n (8),(9) and the Borel-Cantelli Lemma, (18) and (19) are equivalent, respectively, to

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}} h^2(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \geq \varepsilon\gamma_{2^k}^2) < \infty \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0 \tag{22}$$

and

$$\sum_{k=l+1}^{\infty} P(\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in C_{2^{k-l}}} h^2(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) \geq \varepsilon\gamma_{2^k}^2) < \infty \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0. \tag{23}$$

Let

$$D_k = \{\mathbf{i} : (m-1)2^{k-l} < i_m \leq m2^{k-l} \text{ for } m = 1, \dots, d\},$$

then for $k \geq l$ we get

$$P(\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}} h^2(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \geq \varepsilon\gamma_{2^k}^2) \geq P(\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in D_k} h^2(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \geq \varepsilon\gamma_{2^k}^2)$$

$$= P(\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in C_{2^{k-l}}} h^2(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) \geq \varepsilon\gamma_{2^k}^2)$$

and (22) implies (23).

(18)⇒(20) We will prove by induction that for $l \leq d$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}}\ X_{\mathbf{i}} \notin A_{k,l}) < \infty \tag{24}$$

For $l = 1$ (24) is $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}}\ h^2(X_{\mathbf{i}}) > \gamma_{2^k}^2) < \infty$ and follows easily by the Borel-Cantelli lemma. Assume that (24) holds for $l \leq d-1$. To show it for $l+1$ it is enough to prove that for any I with $\mathrm{Card}(I) = l$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}_{I'}\in I_{2^k}}\ 2^{kl} E_I h^2 I_{A_{k,l}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}) > \gamma_{2^k}^2) < \infty \tag{25}$$

By the symmetry of the kernel h we may and will assume that $I=\{1,\dots,l\}$. From (18) it follows that

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_{2^k}^2}\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}} h^2 I_{A_{k,l}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \to 0 \text{ a.s.}.$$

By the regularity of γ_{2^k} (9) and the Borel-Cantelli Lemma we get that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^{k+1}}} h^2 I_{A_{k,l}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{2^k}^2) < \infty.$$

But

$$P_I(\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^{k+1}}} h^2 I_{A_{k,l}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{2^k}^2) \geq P_I(\max_{\mathbf{i}_{I'}\in J_{2^k}} \sum_{\mathbf{i}_I\in I_{2^k}} h^2 I_{A_{k,l}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{2^k}^2)$$

$$\geq \max_{\mathbf{i}_{I'}\in J_{2^k}} P_I(\sum_{\mathbf{i}_I\in I_{2^k}} h^2 I_{A_{k,l}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{2^k}^2),$$

where

$$J_{2^k} = \{(i_1,\dots,i_{d-l}) : 2^k < i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{d-l} \leq 2^{k+1}\}.$$

Let us notice that by the definition of $A_{k,l}$ we have for any $J\subset I$ with $\mathrm{Card}(J)=m<l$

$$2^{km} E_J h^2 I_{A_{k,l}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \leq \gamma_{2^k}^2.$$

Therefore by Lemma 2 we get that

$$\max_{\mathbf{i}_{I'}\in J_{2^k}} P_I(\sum_{\mathbf{i}_I\in I_{2^k}} h^2 I_{A_{k,l}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{2^k}^2) \geq 2^{-l-2},$$

if $\max_{\mathbf{i}_{I'}\in J_{2^k}} E_I \sum_{\mathbf{i}_I\in I_{2^k}} h^2 I_{A_{k,l}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}) > \gamma_{2^k}^2$. Hence

$$P(\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}} h^2 I_{A_{k,l}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{2^k}^2) \geq 2^{-l-2} P(\exists_{i_{I'}\in J_{2^k}}\ 2^{kl} E_I h^2 I_{A_{k,l}}(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) > \gamma_{2^k}^2)$$

and (25) follows.

(19)⇒(21) This is the same as the above, except we use Lemma 1 instead of Lemma 2.

(20)⇒(16). By the regularity assumptions (8), (9) and the Borel-Cantelli Lemma it is enough to prove that for any $t > 0$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\frac{1}{\gamma_{2^k}} \max_{n \le 2^k} |\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_n} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}} h(X_{\mathbf{i}})| \ge t) < \infty.$$

By our assumption (20) it is enough to show that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\frac{1}{\gamma_{2^k}} \max_{n \le 2^k} |\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_n} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}} h I_{A_{k,d}}(X_{\mathbf{i}})| \ge t) < \infty.$$

Since $d_n = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_n} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}} h I_{A_{k,d}}(X_{\mathbf{i}})$ is a martingale, by Doob's maximal inequality we get

$$P(\frac{1}{\gamma_{2^k}} \max_{n \le 2^k} |\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_n} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}} h I_{A_{k,d}}(X_{\mathbf{i}})| \ge t)$$

$$\le \frac{1}{t^2 \gamma_{2^k}^2} E(\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_{2^k}} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}} h I_{A_{k,d}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}))^2 \le \frac{2^{dk}}{t^2 \gamma_{2^k}^2} E h^2 I_{A_{k,d}}(\tilde{X}).$$

Thus it is enough to show that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{dk}}{\gamma_{2^k}^2} E h^2 I_{A_{k,d}}(\tilde{X}) < \infty. \tag{26}$$

Let $\tau = \inf\{k : \tilde{X} \in A_{k,d}\}$, then $\tilde{X} \in A_{\tau,d} \setminus A_{\tau-1,d}$ so by (10) we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{dk}}{\gamma_{2^k}^2} E h^2 I_{A_{k,d}}(\tilde{X}) \le E \sum_{k=\tau}^{\infty} \frac{2^{dk}}{\gamma_{2^k}^2} h^2(\tilde{X})$$

$$\le C E \frac{2^{d\tau}}{\gamma_{2^\tau}^2} h^2(\tilde{X}) \le C \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E \frac{2^{dk}}{\gamma_{2^k}^2} h^2 I_{A_{k,d} \setminus A_{k-1,d}}(\tilde{X}).$$

Let us notice that by the definition of $A_{k,d}$ we have $h^2(\tilde{X})I_{A_{k,d}\setminus A_{k-1,d}}(\tilde{X}) \le \gamma_{2^k}^2$ and $E_I 2^{kl}h^2 I_{A_{k,d}\setminus A_{k-1,d}}(\tilde{X}) \le \gamma_{2^k}^2$ for any $I \subset \{1,\dots,d\}$ with $0 < \mathrm{Card}(I) = l < d$. Thus by Lemma 2

$$2^{-d-2}\min(\binom{2^{k-1}}{d}\frac{1}{\gamma_{2^k}^2}Eh^2 I_{A_{k,d}\setminus A_{k-1,d}}(\tilde{X}),1) \le P(\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^{k-1}}} h^2 I_{A_{k,d}\setminus A_{k-1,d}}(X_{\mathbf{i}}) > 0)$$

$$\le P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^{k-1}}} X_{\mathbf{i}} \in A_{k,d}\setminus A_{k-1,d}) \le P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^{k-1}}} X_{\mathbf{i}} \notin A_{k-1,d}).$$

So condition (20) implies that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\min(\frac{2^{dk}}{\gamma_{2^k}^2}Eh^2 I_{A_{k,d}\setminus A_{k-1,d}}(\tilde{X}),1) < \infty$$

and (26) easily follows.

(21)⇒(16) and (21)⇒(17) In the same way as above we show that (21) implies (26) and that (26) implies (17). □

The next Theorem will show how to deal with the condition (20). Suppose that the sets A_k are given and let us define the sets $C_{k,l}$ and $B_{k,I}$ for $I \subset \{1,\dots,d\}$ with $\mathrm{Card}(I) = l$ by induction over $d-l$:

$$C_{k,d} = A_k$$

$$B_{k,I} = \{x_I \in E^l : 2^{k(d-l)}\mu_{d-l}(C_{k,l+1}^{x_I}) \ge 1 \text{ for } \mathrm{Card}(I) = l\}$$

$$C_{k,l} = \{x \in C_{k,l+1} : x_I \notin B_{k,I} \text{ for all } I \text{ with } \mathrm{Card}(I) = l\}.$$

Theorem 3

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}}\ X_{\mathbf{i}} \in A_k) < \infty \tag{27}$$

if and only if the following condition are satisfied

$$\forall_{l=1,\dots,d-1}\forall_{I\subset\{1,\dots,d\},\mathrm{Card}(I)=l}\ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\exists_{\mathbf{j}\in I_{2^k}^l}\ X_{\mathbf{j}} \in B_{k,I}) < \infty \tag{28}$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{kd}\mu_d(C_{k,1}) < \infty. \tag{29}$$

Proof. Let us notice that (29) immediately implies that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}}\ X_{\mathbf{i}} \in C_{k,1}) < \infty.$$

Since by the definition of sets $C_{k,l}$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\{\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}}\ X_{\mathbf{i}} \in A_k\}\\ &\qquad \subset \{\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}}\ X_{\mathbf{i}} \in C_{k,1}\} \cup \bigcup_{l=1}^{d-1} \bigcup_{I\subset\{1,\ldots d\},\mathrm{Card}(I)=l} \{\exists_{\mathbf{i}_I\in I_{2^k}^l}\ X_{\mathbf{i}_I} \in B_{k,I}\},\end{aligned}$$

hence (28) and (29) imply (27).

To prove the second implication let us first notice that by the definition of $C_{k,l}$ we have

$$2^{k(d-m)}\mu_{d-m}(C_{k,l}^{x_I}) < 1 \text{ for any } I \text{ with } \mathrm{Card}(I) = m \ge l. \tag{30}$$

Hence by Corollary 1

$$P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}}\ X_{\mathbf{i}} \in A_k) \ge P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}}\ X_{\mathbf{i}} \in C_{k,1}) \ge c_d 2^{kd}\mu_d(C_{k,1})$$

so (27) implies (29).

By Corollary 1 and (30) we also get that for any $I \subset \{1,\ldots,m\}$ with $\mathrm{Card}(I) = l = 1,\ldots,d-1$ we have for $J = I^c$ and any $x_I \in E^l$

$$P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}_J\in I_{2^k}^{d-l}}\ X_{\mathbf{i}_J} \in C_{k,l+1}^{x_I}) \ge c_{d-l}2^{k(d-l)}\mu_{d-l}(C_{k,l+1}^{x_I}).$$

Thus

$$P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}}\ X_{\mathbf{i}} \in A_k) \ge P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}\in I_{2^k}}\ X_{\mathbf{i}} \in C_{k,l+1}) \ge c_{d-l}P(\exists_{\mathbf{i}_I\in I_{2^k}^l}\ X_{\mathbf{i}_I} \in B_{k,I})$$

and (27) implies (28). □

3.1 Two-dimensional Case.

In the two-dimensional case let us define for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$

$$f_k(x) = 2^k E_Y(h^2(x,Y) \wedge \gamma_{2^k}^2). \tag{31}$$

Theorem 4 *In the case of $d = 2$ each of the equivalent conditions (16)-(21) is equivalent to the following condition*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^k P(f_k(X) \geq \gamma_{2^k}^2) < \infty \tag{32a}$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{2k} P(h^2(X,Y) \geq \gamma_{2^k}^2, f_k(X) < \gamma_{2^k}^2, f_k(Y) < \gamma_{2^k}^2) < \infty. \tag{32b}$$

Proof. Again, we concentrate on the necessity, since the sufficiency can be proved as in Theorem 2. To obtain (32a) first reduce to the decoupled sum of squares as in Theorem 2 (19). One, then, has

$$P(\sum_{i,j\leq 2^k} h^2(X_i,Y_j) \wedge \gamma_{2^k}^2 > \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{2^k}^2) \geq E_Y \max_{j\leq 2^k} P_X(\sum_{i\leq 2^k} h^2(X_i,Y_j) \wedge \gamma_{2^k}^2 > \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{2^k}^2)$$

Applying Lemma 1 (the case d=1) to the probability appearing in the last expectation, we see that

$$P_X(\sum_{i\leq 2^k} h^2(X_i,Y_j) \wedge \gamma_{2^k}^2 > \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{2^k}^2) \geq \frac{1}{8} I_{\{2^k E_X(h^2\wedge\gamma_{2^k}^2) > \gamma_{2^k}^2\}}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_Y \max_{j\leq 2^k} P_X(\sum_{i\leq 2^k} h^2(X_i,Y_j) \wedge \gamma_{2^k}^2 > \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{2^k}^2) \\
&\quad \geq \frac{1}{8} P_Y(\max_{i\leq 2^k} 2^k E_X(h^2 \wedge \gamma_{2^k}^2) > \gamma_{2^k}^2) \\
&\quad \geq \frac{1}{16} \min(1, 2^k P_Y(2^k E_X(h^2 \wedge \gamma_{2^k}^2) > \gamma_{2^k}^2)),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (32a). But, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(\sum_{i,j\leq 2^k} h^2(X_i,Y_j) \wedge \gamma_{2^k}^2 \geq \gamma_{2^k}^2) \\
&\quad \geq P(\max_{i,j\leq 2^k} h^2(X_i,Y_j) \wedge \gamma_{2^k}^2 I_{f_k(X_i),f_k(Y_j)\leq \gamma_{2^k}^2} \geq \gamma_{2^k}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, using the Section Lemma (Corollary 1) we have that the last quantity

$$\geq 2^{-4}\min(1, 2^{2k}P(h^2 \wedge \gamma_{2^k}^2 \geq \gamma_{2^k}^2, f_k(X), f_k(Y) < \gamma_{2^k}^2))$$

And this implies (32b).□

4 Convergence of series

In this section we will present the multidimensional generalizations of symmetric case of Kolmogorov three series theorem, which states that for independent random variables X_i the following conditions are equivalent

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_i X_i \text{ is a.s. convergent,}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} X_i^2 < \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} E(X_i^2 \wedge 1) < \infty.$$

Let us first consider the two-dimensional case and define

$$c_i(x_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E_Y(h_{i,j}^2(x_i, Y_j)^2 \wedge 1),$$

$$d_j(y_j) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} E_X(h_{i,j}^2(X_i, y_j)^2 \wedge 1).$$

Theorem 5 *Suppose that the functions c_i, d_j are defined as above. Then the following conditions are equivalent*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \varepsilon_i^{(1)} \varepsilon_j^{(2)} h_{i,j}(X_i, Y_j) \text{ is a.s. convergent,} \tag{33}$$

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} h_{i,j}^2(X_i, Y_j) < \infty \text{ a.s.} \tag{34}$$

and

$$c_i(X_i) < \infty \text{ a.s. for all } i \text{ and } d_j(Y_j) < \infty \text{ a.s. for all } j, \tag{35a}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P(c_i(X_i) > 1) < \infty \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P(d_j(Y_j) > 1) < \infty, \tag{35b}$$

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} E(h_{i,j}^2(X_i, Y_j) \wedge 1) I_{\{c_i(X_i) \le 1, d_j(Y_j) \le 1\}} < \infty. \tag{35c}$$

Proof. (33)⇔(34). Let us first notice that (33) and (34) are equivalent, respectively to the following two conditions

$$\forall_{\varepsilon>0} \exists_n \ P(\sup_{k\ge n} |\sum_{n\le i\vee j\le k} \varepsilon_i^{(1)} \varepsilon_j^{(2)} h_{i,j}(X_i, Y_j)| > \varepsilon) < \varepsilon \tag{36}$$

and

$$\forall_{\varepsilon>0} \exists_n \ P(\sum_{n\le i\vee j} h_{i,j}^2(X_i, Y_j) > \varepsilon) < \varepsilon. \tag{37}$$

By the hypercontractivity of Walshes (i.e., for sums of products of Rademacher r.v.'s [B] or [KW2], sect. 3.4.) and the Paley-Zygmund inequality we have

$$P((\sum_{n\le i\vee j} \varepsilon_i^{(1)} \varepsilon_j^{(2)} h_{i,j}(X_i, Y_j))^2 \ge \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n\le i\vee j} h_{i,j}^2(X_i, Y_j)) \ge \frac{1}{324}.$$

Hence (36) implies (37). On the other hand since $d_k = \sum_{n\le i\vee j\le k} \varepsilon_i^{(1)}\varepsilon_j^{(2)} h(X_i,Y_j)$ is a martingale, we get by Doob's inequality

$$P(\sup_{k\ge n}|\sum_{n\le i\vee j\le k}\varepsilon_i^{(1)}\varepsilon_j^{(2)}h_{i,j}(X_i,Y_j)|\ge t(\sum_{n\le i\vee j}h_{i,j}^2(X_i,Y_j))^{1/2})\le t^{-2}$$

and (37) implies (36).

(35)⇒(34). By condition (35a) we get that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} h_{i,j}^2(X_i,Y_j) < \infty$ a.s. for any i and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h_{i,j}^2(X_i,Y_j) < \infty$ a.s. for any j. Hence by condition (35b) it is enough to prove that

$$Z=\sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty}(h_{i,j}^2(X_i,Y_j)\wedge 1)I_{\{c_i(X_i)\le 1,d_j(Y_j)\le 1\}}<\infty \text{ a.s.}. \tag{38}$$

However by Chebyshev's inequality

$$P(Z\ge t)\le t^{-2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty}E(h_{i,j}^2(X_i,Y_j)\wedge 1)I_{\{c_i(X_i)\le 1,d_j(Y_j)\le 1\}}$$

and (38) follows by (35c).

(34)⇒(35). Condition $c_i(X_i) < \infty$ a.s. is equivalent to $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} h_{i,j}^2(X_i,Y_j) < \infty$ a.s., thus (35a) immediately follows by (34).

To prove the condition (35b) let us notice that for sufficiently large n we have

$$P(\sum_{i=n,j=1}^{\infty}h_{i,j}^2(X_i,Y_j)\ge\frac{1}{2})\le 2^{-4}.$$

Let us notice that by Lemma 1 (case $d=1$) we have for any $k\ge n$

$$P_Y(\sum_{i=n,j=1}^{\infty}h_{i,j}^2(X_i,Y_j)\ge c_k(X_k))\ge P_Y(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}h_{k,j}^2(X_k,Y_j)\wedge 1\ge c_k(X_k))\ge 2^{-3}.$$

Thus

$$P(\sum_{i=n,j=1}^{\infty}h_{i,j}^2(X_i,Y_j)\ge\frac{1}{2})\ge 2^{-3}P(\max_{i\ge n}c_i(X_i)>1),$$

so $P(\max_{i\ge n} c_i(X_i) > 1) \le 1/2$, which implies that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P(c_i(X_i > 1) < \infty$. In an analogous way we prove that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P(d_j(Y_j) > 1) < \infty$.

Finally let

$$m = \sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} E(h_{i,j}^2(X_i, Y_j) \wedge 1) I_{\{c_i(X_i) \leq 1, d_j(Y_j) \leq 1\}}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} E_X \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} & h_{i,j}^2(X_i, Y_j) \wedge 1 I_{\{c_i(X_i) \leq 1, d_j(Y_j) \leq 1\}} \\ & \leq (E_X \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h_{i,j}^2(X_i, Y_j) \wedge 1) I_{\{d_j(Y_j) \leq 1\}} \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

and by a similar argument

$$E_Y \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (h_{i,j}^2(X_i, Y_j) \wedge 1) I_{\{c_i(X_i) \leq 1, d_j(Y_j) \leq 1\}} \leq 1.$$

Hence by Lemma 1 we get

$$P(\sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} (h_{i,j}^2(X_i, Y_j) \wedge 1) I_{\{c_i(X_i) \leq 1, d_j(Y_j)\}} \geq \frac{1}{2} m) \geq 2^{-4} \min(m, 1),$$

which implies that $m < \infty$. $\Box$

Before formulating the result in the d-dimensional case we will need a few more definitions. Let us define in this case $A_{0,\mathbf{i}} = E^d$ and then inductively for $l = 1, \ldots, d-1$, $I \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$ with $\mathrm{Card}(I) = l$

$$c_{\mathbf{i}_I}(x_{\mathbf{i}_I}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}_{I'}} E_I'(h^2_{(\mathbf{i}_I, \mathbf{i}_{I'})} I_{A_{l-1,(\mathbf{i}_I, \mathbf{i}_{I'})}}(x_{\mathbf{i}_I}, \tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}_{I'}}) \wedge 1),$$

$$A_{l,\mathbf{i}} = \{x_{\mathbf{i}} \in A_{l-1,\mathbf{i}} : c_{\mathbf{i}_I}(x_{\mathbf{i}_I}) \leq 1 \text{ for all } I \text{ with } \mathrm{Card}(I) = l\}$$

Theorem 6 *Suppose that c_{i_I} and $A_{l,\mathbf{i}}$ are defined as above. Then the following conditions are equivalent*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in Z_+^d} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{i}} h_{\mathbf{i}}(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) \text{ is a.s. convergent,} \tag{39}$$

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in Z_+^d} h_{\mathbf{i}}^2(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) < \infty \ a.s. \tag{40}$$

and

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}_I\in Z_+^{d-1}} h_{\mathbf{i}}^2(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) < \infty \ a.s.\ for\ all\ I\ with\ \mathrm{Card}(I) = d-1 \tag{41a}$$

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}_I\in Z_+^{l}} I_{\{c_{i_I}(\tilde{X}_{i_I})>1\}} < \infty \ a.s.\ for\ all\ I\ with\ l = \mathrm{Card}(I) = 1,2\ldots,d-1 \tag{41b}$$

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}\in Z_+^d} E(h_{\mathbf{i}}^2(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}})\wedge 1) I_{A_{d-1,\mathbf{i}}}(\tilde{X}_{\mathbf{i}}) < \infty \tag{41c}$$

Proof. As above.□

References

[B] A. Bonami, *Etude des coefficients de Fourier des fonctions de $L^p(G)$*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 20 (1970), 335-402.

[CGZ] J. Cuzick, E. Giné and J. Zinn, *Laws of large numbers for quadratic forms, maxima of products and truncated sums of i.i.d. random variables*, Ann. of Probab. 23 (1995), 292-333.

[G] A. Gadidov, *Strong law of large numbers for multilinear forms*, Ann. of Probab. 26 (1998), 902-923.

[GZ] E. Giné and J. Zinn *Marcinkiewicz type laws of large numbers and convergence of moments for U-statistics*, Prob. in Banach spaces, 8, Bowdoin, Maine (1991), Progr. Probab. 30 (1992), 273–291.

[H] W. Hoeffding, *The strong law of large numbers for U-statistics*, Institue of Statistics Mimeo Series 302 (1961).

[KW1] S. Kwapień, W. Woyczyński, *Double stochastic integrals, random quadratic forms and random series in Orlicz spaces* Ann. Prob. 15 (1987), 1072-1096.

[KW2] S. Kwapień, W. Woyczyński, *Random series and stochastic integrals: single and multiple*, Probability and its Applications, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA. (1992), 360 pp.

[M] T. R. McConnell, *Two-parameter strong laws and maximal inequalities for U-statistics*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 107 (1987), 133-151.

[MS] S. J. Montgomery-Smith,*Comparison of sums of independent identically distributed random vectors*, Prob. and Math. Stat. 14 (1993), 281-285.

[S] P. K. Sen, *On L_p convergence of U-statistics*, Ann. Inst. Statist. Math. 26 (1974), 55-60.

[T] H. Teicher, *Convergence of self-normalized generalized U-statistics*, J. Theoret. Probab. 5 (1992), 391-405.

[Zh1] C.-H. Zhang, *Strong law of large numbers for sums of products*, Ann. of Probab. 24 (1996), 1589-1615.

[Zh2] C.-H. Zhang, *Sub-bernoulli functions, moment inequalities and strong laws for nonnegative and symmetrized U-statistics,* Preprint.

R. Latała
Institute of Mathematics
Warsaw University
Banacha 2
02-097 Warszawa
Poland
email: rlatala@mimuw.edu.pl

J. Zinn
Deparment of Mathematics and Statistics
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843
email: jzinn@math.tamu.edu